



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the rental outlay should be appealed to only when other adequate sources of information turn out, in the judgment of the assessors, to fail; and if any contributor has ground for complaint of over-assessment, the burden of initiative and the burden of proof should be placed with him to establish this. That is to say, the principle of the habitation tax as proposed by the New York commission is not open to question, but only the administrative methods proposed.

H. J. DAVENPORT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WOMEN IN MANUFACTURES: A SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

The statistical portion of one of a series of articles on this subject¹ was made the subject of a somewhat extended criticism² in the January number of this *Journal* and it therefore seems suitable to restate as briefly as is consistent with clearness some of the evidence upon which was based the conclusion³ that has been questioned.

The tables discussed were those used in the attempt to show the relative number of men and women employed (1) in "manufacturing and mechanical pursuits," (2) in the cotton industry, (3) in "boots and shoes." These will be dealt with separately, since there are special points to be noted in regard to each, although the criticisms of the first and the reply evoked by the criticism apply equally to

¹ "The History of the Industrial Employment of Women in the United States: An Introductory Study;" see this *Journal*, October, 1906. The portion of the article criticized is Part II, "Statistics of Women in Manufactures, 1810-1900," pp. 480-90.

² "Women in Manufactures: A Criticism" by I. M. Rubinow, of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; see the January, 1907, number of this *Journal*, pp. 40-48.

³ That conclusion may be restated, as no valid reason has yet been adduced for doubting its correctness. It was then said that "evidence has certainly been given to show that any theory that women are a new element in our industrial life, or that they are doing 'men's work,' or that they have 'driven out the men' is a theory unsupported by facts. Instead of coming in as usurpers, women have been from the beginning an important factor in American industry—in the early days of the factory system an indispensable factor—and fifty years ago there were more women relatively to the number of men employed than there are today."

all. The question is raised as to whether in attempting to show the relative number of women employed in each census year from 1850-1900, data from the "manufactures" returns for the years 1850-60 are fairly comparable with those from "manufacturing and mechanical pursuits" from the census of "occupations" for the period 1870-1900.

Before discussing the points of difference between the earlier and later "manufactures" returns and showing why, for the later period, the data from the "occupations" census are preferable, an examination may be made of two tables, resulting from using the two sets of returns. The first table is the one previously used as a basis for conclusions; the second results from substituting the material suggested as proper. It will be noticed that the conclusions deduced are the same in either case.

MANUFACTURING AND MECHANICAL PURSUITS

TABLE I				TABLE II			
Data for 1850-60 from "Manufactures" returns, compared with data 1870-1900 from "Occupations" returns for "Manufacturing and Mechanical Pursuits."				Data for 1850-1900 from "Manufactures" returns.			
Year	Men	Women	Percentage Women of All Employees	Men; after 1870 "Men over 16"	Women; after 1870 "Women over 16"*	Children under 16; Not Report'd 1850-60	Percentage Women of All Employees
1850	731,137	225,922	23.6	731,137	225,922	23.6
1860	1,040,349	270,897	20.6	1,040,349	270,897	20.6
1870	2,353,471	353,950	13.0	1,615,598	323,770	114,628	15.8†
1880	3,153,692	631,034	16.6	2,019,035	531,639	181,921	19.4
1890	4,650,540	1,027,928	18.1	3,327,042	803,686	120,885	18.9
1900	5,772,641	1,312,668	18.5	4,116,610	1,031,609	168,583	19.4

* The schedule called for "Females above 15" until 1900 when it was made the same for both men and women, i.e., "16 years and over." See "Manufactures," *Twelfth Census*, Vol. I, p. ciii.

† The percentage which women formed of the total number of men and women after 1870 would, I believe, be a more correct comparison to make here. That would make this percentage column as follows:

1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900
23.6	20.6	16.6	20.8	19.4	20.0

The tendencies which were said to be indicated by Table I—a decreasing proportion of women employees from 1850-1900, but an increasing proportion from 1870-1900—are also indicated by Table II. In both tables, 1870 is a "point of depression." It is

true that in Table I the decrease was slightly more pronounced, but there is a factor to be allowed for in Table II which minimizes the decrease indicated there. This may be stated somewhat at length here, because of its omission from the abbreviated discussion in the statistical section of the former article.

The reasons for preferring Table I may be stated as follows: The census statistics of the number of persons employed in our manufacturing industries are from two different sets of returns—those from the special census of manufactures, and those from the population census, the latter summarized in a special volume or department of the census reports dealing with “occupations.” These two sets of returns are not only not alike, but may appear to be contradictory at times. The number of women employed is reported only from the “manufactures” returns for 1850–60; for 1870–1900, from both the “manufactures” returns and the “occupations” returns for “manufacturing and mechanical pursuits.” In attempting, therefore, to compare the number of women engaged in “manufactures” at the various census years from 1850 to 1900, there are the two methods open of comparing the returns from the “manufactures” census for 1850–60—the only returns for women that exist for those years—either with the returns from the “manufactures” schedules of 1870–1900, seemingly the logical thing to do on the supposition that the schedules were the same throughout the period; or, secondly, with the returns for “manufacturing and mechanical pursuits” from the “occupations” schedules. The important thing, obviously, is not to compare returns from schedules that are called by the same names, but to compare returns from schedules that report the same things without regard to the names by which they are designated. Therefore, which of these two sets of returns furnishes the more correct basis of comparison depends obviously upon whether the early manufactures’ returns resemble more closely the later manufactures’ returns or the occupations returns for “manufacturing and mechanical pursuits.”

It is to be observed in comparing Table I with Table II: First, that in Table I the terms men and women are correctly used for the entire period 1850–1900, while in Table II it must be explained that a change in the schedule makes it necessary to compare “men” and “women” in 1850–60 with “men over 16,” “women over 16 (or 15),” and children under 16, in 1870–1900. The early census of manufactures called for the “average number of male and

female hands," so that the terms "men" and "women" include boys and girls in those years.⁴ In 1870 and in succeeding years, this schedule was so changed as to report three groups instead of two—men over 16, women over 16 (or 15), and children under 16, girls and boys being grouped together in this third division.⁵ In the manufactures division of the "occupations" returns, it is possible to keep to the old division into two groups; and in this respect they are more easily comparable with the early groups of the other returns.

The early census of manufactures included some important occupational groups which are excluded from the 1870-1900 censuses of manufactures, but are included in the 1870-1900 "manufacturing and mechanical pursuits" division of the "occupations" returns. Such are the building trades, miners, and fisheries. If the total for men in 1850 be examined, it will be found to contain, for example, the following: "Carpenters and builders" 15,276, "coal mining" 15,112, "gold mining" 4,804, "fisheries" 20,814, "stone and marble quarries" 9,996. There is no evidence that I have been able to find to show that manufacturers were either included or excluded, but as no special mention is made of them in the schedule, it seems a fair assumption that they were counted in among the "persons employed" in the industry. However, so far as I am able to discover, there must be some uncertainty as to this point.

Attention is also called to the volume on industry and wealth in the census of 1870, in which the "manufacturers" returns for the three years 1850, 1860, 1870 are conveniently collected and it is carefully pointed out that the statistics of mining, quarrying, and

⁴ See schedule No. 5 of the census of 1850, which was not changed, as to these points under discussion, in 1860, Carroll D. Wright, *History and Growth of the Census*, pp. 45, 46 and pp. 50, 51. Of course the meaning of "average number of male and female hands" is not defined, and is only one of many fine points that it would be interesting and profitable to notice in an extended discussion. That the terms "male" and "female" covered boys and girls, I have found no reason to doubt.

⁵ It is difficult to refrain from calling attention to such curious misstatements in the criticism as the following: "In the data for manufactures in 1850 and 1860, the wage workers are divided into men, women, and children, the sex of the latter not being indicated." It is, of course, only too frequently lamented that the census did not publish statistics of the employment of children until 1870. The same lack of familiarity with the early schedules is shown in the references to the occupational groups, e.g., building trades and miners, which were said to be excluded in the early years.

fishing industry are excluded from the tables of manufactures for 1870, but are included in the statements for 1860 and 1850. (P. 392, note.)

They are, however, although excluded from the manufactures census of 1870-1900, included in the manufactures division of the "occupations" returns for these years, and render these returns more comparable with the manufactures returns of 1850-60 than are those called by the more similar name.

It has already been noted that, although the decrease seemed slightly more pronounced in Table I, there is a factor to be allowed for in Table II which tends to neutralize the difference between them. This is the factor just discussed—the inclusion in 1850-60 of certain occupational groups which are composed almost wholly of men, and which are not included in the 1870-1900 data in Table II. Either to exclude these groups from the early years or to include them in the later period is necessary to put the comparison on a proper basis, and when this is done the decrease in the proportion of women employed will be greater than is now indicated in Table II.

Similar tables, from the two sets of data relating to the cotton industry, have been prepared and are given below to show that Table I did not, as was suggested, exaggerate the decrease to which attention was called.

THE COTTON INDUSTRY

TABLE I				TABLE II			
Data for 1850-60 from "Manufactures" returns compared with data 1870-1900 from "Occupations" returns for "Manufacturing and Mechanical Pursuits."				Data for 1850-1900 from census of "Manufactures."			
Year	Men	Women	Percentage Women of All Employees	Men; after 1870 "Men over 16"	Women; after 1870 "Women over 16"*	Children under 16; No Data for 1850-60	Percentage Women of All Employees
1850.....	33,150	59,136	64.0	33,150	59,136	64.0
1860.....	46,859	75,169	61.5	46,859	75,169	61.5
1870.....	47,208	64,398	57.7	42,790	69,637	22,942	51.4†
1880.....	78,292	91,479	53.8	61,760	84,558	28,341	49.0
1890.....	80,177	92,965	53.4	88,837	106,607	23,432	48.7
1900.....	125,788	120,603	48.9	135,721	126,882	40,258	41.9

* As pointed out before, "women above 15" is the correct designation until 1900.

† The percentage of women among the total number of men and women above 16 if substituted for the above percentages 1870-1900 would give the following result (I believe a more trustworthy one):

1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900
64.0	61.5	61.9	57.7	54.5	48.3

No comment on the table for boots and shoes is necessary, except to call attention to the footnote (note 98, p. 485 of my discussion) which was apparently overlooked.

The earlier and recent statistics for this industry are not fairly comparable for they cover the period of the transition to the factory system. In 1860 this transition was still in progress and the census for that year says. "Although of quite recent introduction in this branch of industry, its [the sewing machine's] employment is gradually bringing about a silent revolution in the boot and shoe manufactures, which is daily assuming the characteristics of a factory system" ("Manufactures," *Eighth Census*, p. lxxi).

EDITH ABBOTT

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

WASHINGTON NOTES

MONEY AND BANKING

RECIPROCITY

FOREIGN COMMERCE

WORK OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

PROBABLE LEGISLATION

The advent of a panic in the midst of prosperous business conditions is a development that has been anticipated for some time by many persons but not forecast by any in precisely the form in which it has appeared. Bank reports rendered to the comptroller of the currency for September 17 last indicated conditions rather more favorable than those which had previously existed so far as reserves were concerned. There was little evidence to suggest the approach of panic conditions except unofficial information occasionally received at the Treasury Department and indicating the existence of serious stress among borrowers. In many cases, even legitimate business firms of high standing seemed to have much difficulty in getting the requisite renewals and fresh loans even for the most necessary purposes, and when they were granted it was only at relatively high rates of interest. On October 15 the first serious trouble made its appearance in connection with a New York bank which had fallen under the control of copper speculators.

In coming to the relief of the market Secretary Cortelyou of the Treasury Department found himself severely handicapped. When Secretary Shaw turned over the department to Mr. Cortelyou, he left a substantial sum in hand but the bulk of the surplus,